Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/623,750	LOWE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ankur Gogia	2187
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n:
(1) <u>Ankur Gogia</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Daniel K. Nichols</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>1 December 2005</u>	Time: 3:00 p.m.	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
112 1 st paragraph - written description		
Claims discussed: 7, 11 and 12		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE C See Continuation Sheet	SENERAL NATURE OF WHA	T WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative not result in resolution of all issues. A brief su 	on. The examiner will provide a arate record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
CHRISTIAN CHACE PRIMARY EXAMINER		
A Mari		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	plicant/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed possible examiner's amendments to claims 7, 11 and 12. Agreed to amend claim 7 such that "a decision engine" on line 7 is replaced by "a plurality of decision engines" and all instances of "the decision engine" are replaced with "each decision engine".

With regards to claim 11, agreed to replace "the decision engine" with "one of the plurality of decision engines".

With regards to claim 12, agreed to replace "the decision engine is" with "the plurality of decision engines includes separate decision engines"...